DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 637 HE 002 625

TITLE	Report of Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities for Faculty and Student Women.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis.
PUB DATE	Apr 71
NOTE	18p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Principles; *Employment Patterns; *Faculty; Guidelines; *Higher Education; *Social Discrimination; *Women Professors

ABSTRACT

The Subcommittee was charged with the responsibility of discovering whether or not there is discrimination against women at the University of Minnesota, and, if so, of developing recommendations to ensure fair and equitable treatment of women in academic areas. They conclude that the evidence reveals discrimination against women in a number of areas--numbers employed, salaries, appointment level, promotions, and numbers of graduate students. Supporting data appear in the appendix. The main body of the paper covers recommendations regarding personnel policies. To redress the balance in female appointments, a formula for departmental hiring is presented along with other procedural steps for hiring. To ensure fair treatment in tenure and promotion, general principles for the process are suggested--explicitly specified criteria, uniform application, systematic collection and dissemination of information, public recording of decisions, and effective grievance machinery. To equalize salaries, an allocation of special funds is advocated. They recommend female appointment to key line administrative positions, provision for development opportunities and search committees consider women. They endorse a statement concerning conflict of interest in lieu of a past nepotism regulation. Finally, they recommend that a unit's personnel decisions become subject to college-level or central administrative review if it persistently fails to correct existing inequities. (LR)

ED056637

University of Minnesota

REPORT

OF

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

FOR

FACULTY AND STUDENT WOMEN

Joan Aldous
V. Elving Anderson
May Brodbeck
Isabel Harris
Eric Klinger
Lonna Malmsheimer (student)
Jan Marmor (ex-officio)
Betty Robinett, Chairman
Becky Sommer (student)

April 15, 1971

HE 002625

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING PERSONNEL DECISIONS 3

HIRING 3

PERSONNEL DECISION MAKING OTHER THAN HIRING 4

The question of quotas. 5

Women in administrative positions. 6

Salaries. 6

Nepotism. 7

SANCTIONS 8

AREAS FOR FURTHER STUDY 8

SUMMARY 9

APPENDIX

Table 1 Present Rank of 1969-70 full-time instructional staff at the University of Minnesota, by sex. 11

Table 2 Rank of 1969-70 full-time instructional staff at time of initial appointment, by sex. 12

Table 3 Number of 1969-70 full-time instructional staff promoted since initial appointment, by sex, and initial rank. 13

Table 4 Proportion of 1969-70 full-time instructional staff with Doctorate degree by rank at appointment, sex, and number of years employed by the University of Minnesota. 14

Table 5 Rank of full-time instructional staff for three different years, by sex. 15

Table 6 Affirmative policy for recruitment of women. 16

INTRODUCTION

The Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities for Faculty and Student Women has been charged with the responsibility of discovering whether or not there is discrimination against women at the University of Minnesota, and, if so, of developing recommendations to ensure fair and equitable treatment of women in academic areas. Since its inception just two months ago, the Subcommittee has gathered material from as many different sources as possible, given this time limitation. Although the Subcommittee has not dealt with as many issues at as great a depth as it would have wished, the weight of evidence from the data studied reveals that there is discrimination against women at the University.* This discrimination probably reflects society's traditional attitude toward women and is not a conscious practice on the part of most individuals at the institution and its effects are demonstrable in many ways.

First, there is a great discrepancy in the number of faculty women as compared with men. Among the 2035 regular full-time instructional staff members in 1969-70 (all campuses) only 12% were females. (Source: Selected Characteristics of the 1969-70 Full-Time Instructional Staff at the University of Minnesota, p. v, BIR, December 1970). Secondly, women, in general, are paid less than men of the same academic rank: "Men in each of the four academic ranks received higher median and mean salaries than women at the same rank". (Source: Selected Characteristics of the 1969-70 Full-Time Instructional Staff at the University of Minnesota, p. vi, BIR, December 1970). Regarding hiring and

---

*Sex discrimination as used throughout this report also includes discrimination as to marital status. There is reason to believe that married women are discriminated against when being considered for hiring. There is also reason to believe that the marital status of a woman is taken into consideration when salaries are being assigned.

promotion, there is evidence from the data supplied by the Bureau of Institutional Research that women tend to be at a lower rank currently (Appendix, Table 1), and, what is more important, they start at a lower rank (Appendix, Table 2). The number of promotions for women who started as assistant professor is significantly less than would be expected from the male experience (Appendix, Table 3). The number of promotions for women who started as instructor is not significantly less than would be expected, but this appears to result from the fact that only a small proportion of these women subsequently attained a doctorate, as compared with the men starting as instructor (Appendix, Table 4). A comparison of three different time periods over the past twenty years shows a tendency for the proportion of women to increase for the lowest two ranks, but to decrease for the associate professor rank, while the proportion among professors has remained constant (Appendix, Table 5). The lack of women in higher-level positions is appropriately described by a statement in Research on the Status of Faculty Women (p. 2): "No study of higher administrative positions was done, because there are too few women for comparative purposes."

The graduate student body at the University also reveals a skewed population. Only 31 percent of graduate students are women. (See Graduate School Biennial Report for 1968-70, p. 2) It is reasonable to suppose that current employment practices at the University of Minnesota and other academic institutions result in decreased expectations on the part of graduate women, thereby perpetuating the lack of balance in male-female student population.

In the light of these data on existing inequities with respect to the status of women at the University of Minnesota, the Subcommittee submits the following recommendations regarding various procedures, regulations, and facilities. Implementation of the recommendations should reduce, if not wholly eliminate, these inequities within a reasonable period of time.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING PERSONNEL DECISIONS

Broadly speaking, academic discrimination against women has two main roots. One of these is the set of procedures by which academic units arrive at personnel decisions in general. These have in the past been unduly secretive, peremptory, and vulnerable to caprice. They have therefore fostered irrational, individual, and institutional discrimination, including that which affects women. The second main root is the society's attitudes specifically regarding women, which are manifested in ingrained, everyday prejudices, many of them widely unchallenged or even acknowledged. Until the University attains its goal of equitable treatment for women, it is necessary to develop procedures that specifically counter prejudice against women. The recommendations that follow attempt both to revise some general procedures and to propose additional safeguards for women.

HIRING

To redress the balance in female faculty appointments, we urge that immediate action be taken by the various departments and academic units to recruit women faculty members. Because each department faces different circumstances with respect to current numbers of women present and the pool of qualified women for employment, we recommend the following departmental guideline:

> Each department should recruit women at least to the point where the proportion in the department is rougly equal to the average proportion of women obtaining the requisite advanced degree in the discipline in the last five years.* The task force recognizes the difficulties involved in fulfilling this goal immediately given the degree of discrimination existing in various of the departments. We, therefore, are recommending a time period of five years for reaching this goal. (See Appendix, Table 6, for a formula which suggests the numbers an academic unit must hire each year over a five-year time period to meet its overall goal, given only replacement positions. When new positions are filled by women, the numbers of women to be added through replacements, will necessarily be altered).

*Data on the number and percent of women Ph.D.'s, by field, from American universities is available from the annual Summary Report: Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities, National Research Council.

In implementing this guideline we recommend the following:

1. Some women be appointed to all personnel and recruitment committees.

2. Such committees be charged to consider qualified women equally with men.

3. Each department advertise open positions nationally.

4. Whenever two or more candidates for a position are approximately equally well qualified, preference will be granted to women and to members of ethnic minorities.

5. In judging qualifications, it is incumbent on the evaluators to look beyond formal credentials, which may themselves reflect the effects of past discrimination, and attempt to form judgments of probable overall promise--judgments of a candidate's abilities to contribute to the University's primary missions.

PERSONNEL DECISION MAKING OTHER THAN HIRING

1. The best long-run protection against unequal treatment of women is a procedure for personnel decisions that best protects faculty members in general. Such a system incorporates explicitly specified criteria for promotion that are applied uniformly, that are restricted to actual performance in instruction, research, and service, and that are applied on the basis of information about the faculty member being evaluated which is systematically collected and systematically communicated to all faculty participating in the decision. Furthermore, the decision-makers must be held accountable by requiring them to record the reasons for their decisions, by granting a disappointed faculty member the right to know those reasons, by providing him with access to effective grievance machinery for the redress of wrongs.

2. A revision of the University tenure regulations now in progress incorporates these features. While the Subcommittee is not in a position to endorse the entire draft as it stands--indeed, the draft is still in a state of flux--we do endorse the inclusion of the features described above.

3. Grievance procedures that can accommodate complaint of discrimination should be publicized prominently and completely so as to inform all members of

the University community of the available avenues of redress. Although a complete description of grievance procedures should appear in the Faculty Handbook, experience suggests that this is insufficient. The Subcommittee recommends that a description of grievance procedures be enclosed with all notices of reappointment and termination.

3. Discrimination against women is sufficiently engrained in academic practice that the short-run alleviation of discrimination requires certain special measures. The Subcommittee recommends that all grievance committees appointed to redress the grievance of a woman faculty member include at least one woman member on the committee.

4. Promotion must be considered without bias with respect to sex.

5. Departmental committees that make recommendations on tenure and promotions should include at least one woman member.

6. The underlying incentive systems that govern many departments discourage or fail to encourage the attainment of equity in the treatment of women. In order to introduce a shift in these incentive systems, the criteria for deciding the promotions and salaries of department chairmen, higher-level administrators, and other faculty in decision-making positions should be explicitly enlarged to include their contributions to the attainment of equal treatment for women and ethnic minorities.

__ question of quotas. Unlike the problems of hiring enough women or minority-group members, the criterion of equity in promotion policies in an ideal world is relatively simple. Equity is achieved when the proportion of women is the same for professors as for all other ranks. Although this makes the idea of a quota seem feasible and simple, it seems unwise to impose one at this time. The

recommendations presented above would, if adopted, create means for rectifying past injustices and reducing future ones while still permitting the continuous exercise of personal judgment. If over the course of a few years the proposed policies prove ineffective, it may become desirable to adopt a quota system. It seems preferable, however, to defer that step until clearly necessary.

Women in administrative positions. The University has in the past virtually excluded women from positions of line authority in its highest administrative echelons. It has thereby removed one source of checks against discrimination against women at lower levels. It also, of course, thus impugns the capacity of its women faculty to administer, and it truncates the administrative aspirations of women faculty and academically-inclined students.

1. The University should appoint, when openings occur or are created, several women to key line administrative positions at both the central and collegiate levels.

2. Provision should be made for developmental opportunities; e.g., appointments should be made to low level posts which allow individuals to acquire the appropriate knowledge and skills for promotion to high level posts.

3. All Search Committees should be charged with the responsibility of considering qualified women for all administrative positions.

Salaries. As the Selected Characteristics and Status of Women reports document, there is evidence of serious salary discrimination against women. The Subcommittee recommends that academic units take immediate action to equalize salaries using available funds. Since academic units with preponderant women faculty have over a long period been penalized with respect to salaries, the Subcommittee also recommends that central administration allocate special funds to these units for salary upgrading.

Nepotism. In Vice President Shepherd's memorandum of April 5, 1971 to the various concerned committees, he takes note of the fact that the University's present nepotism policy, though flexibly interpreted and applied, does offer rationale for discrimination on the basis of sex. The Subcommittee strongly supports this acknowledgment and adds that there is reason to believe that the present policy has sometimes been utilized so as to result in discrimination against women. It is therefore happy to endorse, with two emendations, the proposed new statement of policy contained in Dr. Shepherd's memorandum. The emendations it suggests occur as deletions in the last sentence in the proposal. This sentsnce, with the suggested deletions in brackets, reads as follows:

> "However, to avoid possible conflict of interest which could result from peer judgment, supervision or administrative review procedures, a person so related must not participate [either formally or informally] in decisions to hire, retain, promote or determine the salary of the other person, [and must not be assigned supervisory responsibility for work of the other person.]"

We feel that the phrase "formally or informally", while adding nothing substantial to the proposal, may unduly inhibit or discredit quite legitimate suggestions to colleagues regarding the possible hiring of a qualified relative.

The final clause of the proposal, prohibiting supervisory responsibility between relatives, does not appear relevant to academic, as contrasted with civil service, circumstances. Neither department chairmen nor administrators are in what can realistically be called a "supervisory" relation to their academic colleagues, but the clause may appear to prohibit relatives from acting as departmental chairmen or administrators. This is unduly punitive and restrictive on career opportunities, as one related colleague, whether or not he is a departmental chairman or administrator, would nevertheless be disqualified and would disqualify himself from any hiring, retention, promotion, or salary decision procedures with respect to his relatives. We therefore recommend the omission of this phrase.

SANCTIONS

If a unit of the University persistently fails to correct existing inequities in regard to women or ethnic minorities and is unable to demonstrate that the reasons for its failure are beyond its control, all of its personnel decisions should become subject to college-level or central administration review until such time as the unit appears capable of eliminating discrimination by itself. The decision first to impose administrative review and thereafter to end it should be vested in the Senate Judicial Committee acting upon a recommendation of or an appeal from a lower-level grievance committee, as provided in the proposed revision of the tenure regulations, or upon request of the University's EEO officer or by any officer duly designated to oversee compliance with University policy regarding equal employment opportunity.

AREAS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The subtleties of discrimination against women which pervade our society are many and varied, and not all of these can be discussed in this report. The Subcommittee would like, however, to list the following matters related to sex discrimination which should be given close scrutiny when time permits.

1. The University's sick leave policy should be examined as it concerns non-academic leaves such as those related to maternity.

2. A study should be made of the availability of day care centers immediately accessible to the University, and this information publicized to all students and faculty. The feasibility of instituting a baby-sitter service (such as that currently operating on the Duluth Campus) should be considered.

3. A careful study of Carl Auerbach's revision of "Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure" should be made as it relates to women faculty, and recommendations should be sent to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs.

4. A study should be made of departments to discover whether or not the instructional work load of women is heavier than that of men and whether research monies are equitably distributed.

5. The Campus Committee on Placement should be advised that recruitment through University facilities must be without discrimination as to sex.

SUMMARY

The Subcommittee recommends that, in every way possible, existing inequities be redressed and that every attempt be made to avoid inequities in the future. This issue can no longer be overlooked, particularly with governmental sanctions being invoked against institutions which do not comply with equal opportunity practices (Executive Orders 11246, and 11375). More than this, however, is the need for simple justice. With the cooperation of the entire faculty, a better climate in regard to women's role in the academic world will prevail.

APPENDIX

Present Rank of 1969-70 Full-Time Instructional Staff of the University of Minnesota, by Sex.

Table 1

Present Rank	Male		Female		Total	Female/Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Instructor	133	7.4	66	27.8	199	33.2
Assistant Prof.	382	21.2	85	35.9	467	18.2
Associate Prof.	496	27.6	39	16.5	535	7.3
Professor	787	43.8	47	19.8	834	5.6
Total	1,798	100.0	237	100.0	2,035	11.6

Adapted from Selected Characteristics of the 1969-70 Full-Time Instructional Staff at the University of Minnesota, BIR, December 1970).

Rank of 1969-70 Full-Time Instructional Staff

At Time of Initial Appointment, by Sex.

Table 2

	Male		Female		Total	Female/Total
Initial Rank	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Instructor	461	26.1	128	54.9	589	21.7
Assistant Prof.	792	44.7	78	33.5	870	9.0
Associate Prof.	365	20.6	19	8.2	384	4.9
Professor	152	8.6	8	3.4	160	5.0
Totals	1770	100.0	233	100.0	2003	11.6

Adapted from Selected Characteristics of the 1969-70 Full-Time Instructional Staff at the University of Minnesota, BIR, December 1970).

Number of 1969-70 Full-Time Instructional Staff

Promoted since Initial Appointment, by Sex, and Initial Rank.

Table 3

Initial Rank	Male Total No.	Male Promoted No.	Male Promoted %	Female Total No.	Female Promoted * No.	Female Promoted * %
Instructor	461	335	72.7	128	Obs. 65 Exp. 72.5	50.8 56.6
Assistant Prof.	792	532	67.2	78	Obs. 39 Exp. 50.9	50.0 65.3
Associate Prof.	365	264	72.3	19	Obs. 15 Exp. 13.9	78.9 73.2

* Expected number of promotions for women based on experience for males (adjusted for initial rank, years of service, and present degree). The difference between the observed and expected numbers is significant only for those women initially appointed as Assistant Professor ($P < .05$).

Table 4

Proportion of 1969-70 Full-Time Instructional Staff with Doctorate Degree by Rank at Appointment, Sex, and Number of Years Employed by the University of Minnesota

	Initial Appointment as Instructor				Initial Appointment as Assistant Professor			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
Years at Minnesota	Total No.	Doctorate %	Total No.	Doctorate %	Total No.	Doctorate %	Total No.	Doctorate %
1-5 years	171	19.9	73	6.8	356	78.1	33	54.5
6-10 years	89	53.9	16	18.8	171	81.3	23	69.6
11 or more	201	64.7	39	17.9	265	81.9	22	72.7
All years combined	461	46.0	128	11.7	792	80.1	78	64.1

Based on data from BIR, March 1971

Table 5

Rank of Full-Time Instructional Staff for Three Different Years, by Sex

Rank	Total Number			Number of Women			Women / Total (%)		
	1950-51	1962-63	1969-70	1950-51	1962-63	1969-70	1950-51	1962-63	1969-70
Instructor	297	280	199	79	75	66	26.6	26.8	33.2
Assistant Professor	246	352	467	38	62	85	15.4	17.6	18.2
Associate Professor	169	349	535	19	34	39	11.2	9.7	7.3
Professor	262	525	834	14	28	47	5.3	5.3	5.6
Total	974	1506	2035	150	199	237	15.4	13.2	11.6

Based on data from BIR, April 1971

Affirmative Policy for Recruitment of Women

Table 6

t = transitional rate, moving from actual % to goal %
a = actual % of women at present
g = goal %
y = number of years to reach goal %
r = proportion of faculty replaced each year (excluding new positions)

$$t = a + \frac{g-a}{y\ r}$$

Consider y = 5 and r = .05 yr = .25

	No. in faculty	No. replaced in 5 yrs.	Women Now/Lost		Goal Women	Women to be hired	Transitional rate
College A	200	50	4	1	24	21/50	42%
College B	200	50	20	5	40	25/50	50%

using formula $t = a + \frac{g-a}{yr}$

	a	g	y	r	t
College A	2%	12%	5	.05	42%
College B	10%	20%	5	.05	50%